

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Cc: [REDACTED] [@live.co.uk](#)
Subject: Deadline 10 submission - general comment
Date: 12 October 2021 21:48:29
Attachments: [Deadline 10 Submission.doc](#)

Please find below my submission fo deadline 10 also attached as a word document.

Thank you

Deadline 10 Submission

Sizewell C – a recipe for disaster

Ingredients

1. Questionable EPR technology

The applicant claims that this is proven technology. This is not true. So far one twin reactor has been completed but has had to shutdown due to flaws. The other plants are years behind schedule and billions over-budget. The applicant claims that lessons have been learnt from Hinkley, Flamanville and Finland are never mentioned. Would you take on a builder who had never successfully completed a house?

2. An applicant in deep financial trouble

EDF's financial woes are well documented and they have their own agenda for wanting Sizewell C built. Even Macron is no offering to build any more EPR plants in France. What does that tell you?

3. A very poorly thought out project plan

Last minute changes to key parts of the plan e.g. Transport strategy and water supply strategy. These are vital elements of the whole project. Proposing, at the 11th hour, to utilise options they have previously rejected as unwieldy, too expensive, would take too long to implement and damaging to the environment. And yet here they are back on the table.

4. Rely on out of date government documents to push your case citing “urgency” and “need” in an attempt to override the many serious and obvious flaws in building the plant at Sizewell. EN6 in particular is frequently cited as naming Sizewell as a suitable site. I could have written EN6 as all it does is list the sites round the country which already had pre-existing nuclear plants. Times, attitudes to the environment and climate have all changed significantly since Sizewell B was built. What may have been appropriate then is far from appropriate now and a lot of the land surrounding the original plants is now protected although the applicant is more than happy to ride roughshod over this using IROPI.... Or is it the applicant's interest?

The applicant would have been far better considering Hartlepool as it has the industrial heritage and infrastructure that a project of this size requires.

5. Fail to Plan, Plan to fail

It is clear from the many volte face the applicant has exercised throughout the planning process

that they haven't got a clue what they are doing (see Flamanville and Finland) Despite this they are determined to turn this scenic and wildlife rich area into an industrial wasteland with 30+ metre high spoil heaps and irreversible damage to the AONB, RSPB minsmere & SSSI. Destroying valuable biodiversity which has taken decades to establish while blithely claiming they will create replacement biodiversity elsewhere by buying up a couple of fields a few miles away. And we are supposed to say "well that's ok then". As one journalist put it "that's rather like saying you can knock down St Paul's Cathedral now because the Ipswich Odeon has been turned into a church!"

6. Use so-called independent reports to prove that what they intend doing is not harmful to whatever e.g. birdlife, sea life, the environment, the SSSI etc. One example is the Hinkley point acoustic fish deterrent.

"Hinkley Point C asked the Government's independent expert body [Cefas](#) to use the latest data to look at the impact of the power station on fish stocks in the Bristol Channel. The detailed work concluded that the power station's predicted impact was "negligible".

These findings would be a great deal more credible if EDF had not paid Cefas £8.3m between 2015 and 2018. How often have Cefas "independent" reports been used to prove the applicant's point at Sizewell C?

7. Be evasive about the costs

The figure of £20 billion is often used however this is cost of Hinkley Point C. There is significantly more infrastructure work required on this side of the country. I believe the final cost of Sizewell C will be significantly more than £20bn.

Method

1. Find a greenfield site in an extremely rural locality with none of the infrastructure required to support the biggest industrial project in Europe. Creating the required infrastructure will add billions to the cost of the project including building roads, bypassing villages, building accommodation blocks, a desalination plant, a roundabout, park and ride facilities, link roads, a seawall on an eroding coast. These works are to be carried out concurrently with the building of the plant – this is guaranteed to slow things down and delay the project well beyond the alleged 12 years it will take to complete.

2. Select a protected greenfield site in an area of outstanding natural beauty, next door to a world famous bird Sanctuary and requiring a road to built across an area of SSSI probably irrevocably damaging it.

3. Pick a coastal location where erosion is an ongoing and serious problem and sea levels are expected to rise. Necessitating massive sea wall defences which may ultimately not be high enough or long enough! Further adding to the project costs.

4. Choose the driest area in the country when you know that the plant will require 5 million litres of fresh water a day during the build and 2.5 million litres of fresh water every day for the next 60 years. Once the plant is operational 2.5m litres of water is required every day for cooling and becomes a safety issue so its supply will always have priority over any other customers of the water company.

8a Take the attitude that the water company is legally required to provide the water - even if

there isn't any! Climate change may mean that there is insufficient water to serve this area of the country never mind provide millions of litres of fresh water daily to stop a nuclear power plant blowing up.

5. Ignore the demographics of the immediate area and claim that it needs the economic boost and jobs the project would bring. There are far more job vacancies in this area than there are unemployed people. The area is agriculture and tourism based, the tourists will disappear - no-one goes on holiday to a building site and the farmers will be seriously disrupted especially during harvest time when the main road to be used by the projects HGVs is the same road the tractors use. Meanwhile there will be an influx of 1000s of skilled labour and nowhere for them to stay.

6. Ignore the other major energy projects planned concurrently for the area. There will be total gridlock on the roads, the vehicles and workers on all these projects will be literally tripping over each other.

7. Come in like [REDACTED]

Adopt a patronising and dismissive attitude towards consultees. Fail to engage with non-key consultees. This has been commented on endlessly throughout the hearings and written representations, we are not making it up despite the applicant's protestations to the contrary. The only parties the applicant has been prepared to talk to are the two councils, Suffolk County and East Suffolk. And even then they have chosen to reject such sensible options as the "D2" road and instead offering a very badly thought out Sizewell link road. Had they selected the former option millions of CO2 miles would have been saved. The idea that Sizewell C is low carbon is laughable as is the suggestion by the applicant that the balance from the build would be repaid in less than a year. Ridiculous.

8. Spread propaganda. Assure everyone that the area will positively thrive from being turned into an industrial wasteland, imply that we are desperate for money and employment neither of which is true. Offer many thousands of jobs when in reality the vast majority of workers will come from elsewhere in the uk and those jobs that will be available locally are the low skilled cleaning and catering jobs. Promise that detrimental affects will be mitigated for while carefully avoiding offering any actual mitigation.

9. Claim the build will only take 12 years

Completion in 12 years? With the current track record for EPR reactors, the unprecedented infrastructure works required and the other concurrent projects in the immediate vicinity this is pure fantasy.

Gwen Erskine-Hill

[REDACTED]

Middleton Moor

Deadline 10 Submission

Sizewell C – a recipe for disaster

Ingredients

1. Questionable EPR technology

The applicant claims that this is proven technology. This is not true. So far one twin reactor has been completed but has had to shutdown due to flaws. The other plants are years behind schedule and billions over-budget. The applicant claims that lessons have been learnt from Hinkley, Flamanville and Finland are never mentioned. Would you take on a builder who had never successfully completed a house?

2. An applicant in deep financial trouble

EDF's financial woes are well documented and they have their own agenda for wanting Sizewell C built. Even Macron is no offering to build any more EPR plants in France. What does that tell you?

3. A very poorly thought out project plan

Last minute changes to key parts of the plan e.g. Transport strategy and water supply strategy. These are vital elements of the whole project. Proposing, at the 11th hour, to utilise options they have previously rejected as unwieldy, too expensive, would take too long to implement and damaging to the environment. And yet here they are back on the table.

4. Rely on out of date government documents to push your case citing “urgency” and “need” in an attempt to override the many serious and obvious flaws in building the plant at Sizewell. EN6 in particular is frequently cited as naming Sizewell as a suitable site. I could have written EN6 as all it does is list the sites round the country which already had pre-existing nuclear plants. Times, attitudes to the environment and climate have all changed significantly since Sizewell B was built. What may have been appropriate then is far from appropriate now and a lot of the land surrounding the original plants is now protected although the applicant is more than happy to ride roughshod over this using IROPI.... Or is it the applicant's interest?

The applicant would have been far better considering Hartlepool as it has the industrial heritage and infrastructure that a project of this size requires.

5. Fail to Plan, Plan to fail

It is clear from the many volte face the applicant has exercised throughout the planning process that they haven't got a clue what they are doing (see Flamanville and Finland) Despite this they are determined to turn this scenic and wildlife rich area into an industrial wasteland with 30+ metre high spoil heaps and irreversible damage to the AONB, RSPB minsmere & SSSI. Destroying valuable biodiversity which has taken decades to establish while blithely claiming they will create replacement biodiversity elsewhere by buying up a couple of fields a few miles away. And we are supposed to say “well that's ok then”. As one journalist put it “that's rather like saying you can knock down St Paul's Cathedral now because the Ipswich Odeon has been turned into a church!”

6. Use so-called independent reports to prove that what they intend doing is not harmful to whatever e.g. birdlife, sea life, the environment, the SSSI etc. One example is the Hinkley point acoustic fish deterrent.

"Hinkley Point C asked the Government's independent expert body [Cefas](#) to use the latest data to look at the impact of the power station on fish stocks in the Bristol Channel. The detailed work concluded that the power station's predicted impact was "negligible".

These findings would be a great deal more credible if EDF had not paid Cefas £8.3m between 2015 and 2018. How often have Cefas "independent" reports been used to prove the applicant's point at Sizewell C?

7. Be evasive about the costs

The figure of £20 billion is often used however this is cost of Hinkley Point C. There is significantly more infrastructure work required on this side of the country. I believe the final cost of Sizewell C will be significantly more than £20bn.

Method

1. Find a greenfield site in an extremely rural locality with none of the infrastructure required to support the biggest industrial project in Europe. Creating the required infrastructure will add billions to the cost of the project including building roads, bypassing villages, building accommodation blocks, a desalination plant, a roundabout, park and ride facilities, link roads, a seawall on an eroding coast. These works are to be carried out concurrently with the building of the plant – this is guaranteed to slow things down and delay the project well beyond the alleged 12 years it will take to complete.

2. Select a protected greenfield site in an area of outstanding natural beauty, next door to a world famous bird Sanctuary and requiring a road to built across an area of SSSI probably irrevocably damaging it.

3. Pick a coastal location where erosion is an ongoing and serious problem and sea levels are expected to rise. Necessitating massive sea wall defences which may ultimately not be high enough or long enough! Further adding to the project costs.

4. Choose the driest area in the country when you know that the plant will require 5 million litres of fresh water a day during the build and 2.5 million litres of fresh water every day for the next 60 years. Once the plant is operational 2.5m litres of water is required every day for cooling and becomes a safety issue so its supply will always have priority over any other customers of the water company.

8a Take the attitude that the water company is legally required to provide the water - even if there isn't any! Climate change may mean that there is insufficient water to serve this area of the country never mind provide millions of litres of fresh water daily to stop a nuclear power plant blowing up.

5. Ignore the demographics of the immediate area and claim that it needs the economic boost and jobs the project would bring. There are far more job vacancies in this area than there are unemployed people. The area is agriculture and tourism based, the tourists will disappear - no-one goes on holiday to a building site and the farmers will be seriously disrupted especially during harvest time when the main road to be used by the projects HGVs is the same road the tractors use. Meanwhile there will be an influx of 1000s of skilled labour and nowhere for them to stay.

6. Ignore the other major energy projects planned concurrently for the area. There will be total gridlock on the roads, the vehicles and workers on all these projects will be literally tripping over each other.

7. Come in like [REDACTED]

Adopt a patronising and dismissive attitude towards consultees. Fail to engage with non-key consultees. This has been commented on endlessly throughout the hearings and written representations, we are not making it up despite the applicant's protestations to the contrary. The only parties the applicant has been prepared to talk to are the two councils, Suffolk County and East Suffolk. And even then they have chosen to reject such sensible options as the "D2" road and instead offering a very badly thought out Sizewell link road. Had they selected the former option millions of CO2 miles would have been saved. The idea that Sizewell C is low carbon is laughable as is the suggestion by the applicant that the balance from the build would be repaid in less than a year. Ridiculous.

8. Spread propaganda. Assure everyone that the area will positively thrive from being turned into an industrial wasteland, imply that we are desperate for money and employment neither of which is true. Offer many thousands of jobs when in reality the vast majority of workers will come from elsewhere in the UK and those jobs that will be available locally are the low skilled cleaning and catering jobs. Promise that detrimental affects will be mitigated for while carefully avoiding offering any actual mitigation.

9. Claim the build will only take 12 years

Completion in 12 years? With the current track record for EPR reactors, the unprecedented infrastructure works required and the other concurrent projects in the immediate vicinity this is pure fantasy.

Gwen Erskine-Hill

[REDACTED]

Middleton Moor